DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 762 LI 004 483

TITLE	Review of Federal Library Operations in Metropolitan Washington.
INSTITUTION	Comptroller General of the U.S., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	24 Jul 73
NOTE	47p.; (14 references); Report to the Congress
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. General Accounting Office, Rm. 6417, 441 G St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20548 (B-174013; $1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Centralization; Copyrights; Federal Government; *Government Libraries; Library Acquisition; Library Collections; Library Cooperation; Library Programs; Management; Microforms; Special Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	*District of Columbia

ABSTRACT

The General Accounting Office reviewed Federal libraries, i.e., executive agency libraries, in Metropolitan Washington to identify problems common to the libraries and to determine how they are being handled. The review revealed that: a central depository could provide numerous benefits; microforms are not used substantially; central direction is required for research projects; cooperative arrangements for acquiring materials have not been entered into by Federal libraries; and, Federal libraries have not integrated their services which has resulted in duplication, conflicts and reduced efficiency. It is recommended that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) should be more active in encouraging improved management and coordination of Federal library activities. Specifically, OMB should initiate a cost-benefit study to determine the feasibility of establishing a central depository for Federal libraries and should develop policies and plans to: encourage the use of microform publications or other methods of compacting library materials; coordinate library research; encourage cooperation among libraries to minimize multiple acquisitions of materials; and, encourage the integration of Federal agency information systems. (Author/SJ)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 082762

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Review Of Federal Library Operations In Metropolitan Washington B-174013

BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 24, 1973

LI 004 483

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-174013

To the President of the Senate and the
Speaker of the House of Representatives

We have reviewed Federal library operations in Metropolitan Washington.

We made our review pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67).

Copies of this report are being sent to the Director, Office of Management and Budget.

Elmer B. Staats

Comptroller General
of the United States

Contents

		Page
DIGEST		1
CHAPTER		
1	INTRODUCTION	5
2	NEED FOR IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF FEDERAL LIBRARIES	7
	The historic need for improved management of libraries	7
	Advisory groups not effective in providing library management leadership	9
	Conclusion	10
	Recommendation to the Director, OMB	10
	Agency comments	11
3	NEED TO CONSIDER CENTRAL STORAGE FOR LITTLE-USED MATERIALS	12
	Need for a central depository	12
	Non-Federal central depositories	13
	Age and use of Federal library materials	15
	Benefits of a central depository	16
	Conclusions	18
	Agency comments	18
	Recommendation to the Director, OMB	18
4	OPPORTUNITIES FOR OTHER IMPROVEMENTS IN FEDERAL LIBRARY OPERATIONS	19
	Microform publications	19
	Coordination of research on library operations	22
	Cooperation in acquiring materials	25
	Integration of Federal agency information systems	28
	Conclusions	31
	Recommendations to the Director, OMB	31
	Agency comments	32
5	THE COPYRIGHT ISSUE IN MAKING LIBRARY SERVICES AVAILABLE	33

CHAPTER		Page
6	SCOPE OF REVIEW	35
APPENDIX		
I	GAO library questionnaire returns	37
II	Letter dated February 13, 1973, from the Assistant Director, Office of Management and Budget, to the General Accounting Office	38
III	Letter dated January 12, 1973, from the Executive Secretary of the Federal Library Committee to the General Accounting Office	42
IV	Principal officials of the Office of Management and Budget responsible for the administration of activities discussed in this report	44

ABBREVIATIONS

FLC	Federal Library Committee
GAO	General Accounting Office
GSA	General Services Administration
OMB	Office of Management and Budget

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

REVIEW OF FEDERAL LIBRARY OPERATIONS IN METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON B-174013

D I G E S T

WHY THE REVIEW WAS MADE

Increasing population, rising educational levels, and the explosive growth of recorded knowledge have greatly increased demands on Federal libraries for information services. Fiscal year 1970 expenditures for Federal agency library operations have been estimated to exceed $128 million.

GAO reviewed Federal libraries in Metropolitan Washington to identify problems common to the libraries and to determine how they were being dealt with. "Federal libraries," as used throughout this report, refers only to executive agency libraries.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Federal libraries have common problems, such as housing their expanding collections and obtaining equipment. Federal libraries also engage in common activities, such as cataloging, storing, and retrieving books and other materials. These commonalities afford various opportunities for improved management and coordination of Federal library activities.

The need for improved management of Federal libraries has long been widely recognized; it was expressed in 1898 by the Librarian of Congress, in 1937 by the American Library Association, and in 1963 by the Brookings Institution. Library advisory groups, such as the Federal Library Committee, meet some needs of the Federal libraries, such as developing proposals for research projects. The Committee, however, has not made recommendations to OMB because it has encountered difficulty in reaching decisions on proposed recommendations which certain members did not consider to be in the interest of their agency libraries.

The libraries are managed primarily through the direction of their respective agency heads and the central direction of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Improvement in administering Federal library operations requires a more active role by OMB in the management of libraries. (See pp. 7 to 11.)

In the metropolitan area:

--A central depository for little-used materials could result in substantially reducing space costs, eliminating duplicate copies of materials, and postponing or eliminating the need for additional library facilities and could provide other benefits. (See pp. 12 to 18.)

--Federal libraries were not substantially using microform publications although they generally cost less than hardcopy and are cheaper to reproduce and ship. Lack of funds to obtain equipment, lack of equipment standards,

Tear Sheet. Upon removal, the report cover date should be noted hereon.

and resistance by library users appear to hinder wider use of such publications. (See pp. 19 to 22.)

--Central direction is needed to coordinate the selection of research projects, to provide a central collection point for information on ongoing and completed research, and to determine the extent to which Federal libraries should implement research recommendations. (See pp. 22 to 24.)

--Federal libraries have only infrequently entered into cooperative agreements for acquiring library materials. In contrast, non-Federal libraries have entered into such agreements to reduce overall costs. GAO believes that opportunities for similar agreements exist for Federal libraries. (See pp. 24 to 27.)

--Federal libraries and their other information systems are not integrated. This results in duplication of effort, conflicts, and diminished efficiency of the total information system. (See pp. 28 to 31.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

OMB should be more active in encouraging improved management and coordination of Federal library activities. Specifically, OMB should initiate a cost-benefit study to determine the feasibility of establishing a central depository for Federal libraries and should develop policies and plans to:

--Encourage the use of microform publications or other methods of compacting library materials.

--Coordinate library research.

--Encourage cooperation among libraries to minimize multiple acquisitions of materials.

--Encourage the integration of Federal agency information systems. (See pp. 10, 18, and 31.)

AGENCY ACTIONS AND UNRESOLVED ISSUES

According to OMB, the report does an important service by highlighting several library management problems. OMB commented that the Federal Library Committee is handling or can handle most of the recommendations and that OMB would work closely with the Committee. OMB, however, expressed some apprehension about intruding into the routine management of the individual agency libraries with respect to some of GAO's recommendations. (See app. III.)

GAO believes that the Committee has limited capability--no statutory status, no authority, and no personnel other than an Executive Secretariat--to effect any meaningful action without OMB's active support. GAO believes further that the matters in this report relate to broad management policies and procedures which transcend routine management of individual agency libraries.

The Committee said that it would welcome the opportunity to review the need for a central depository and that its current work program included projects directed toward

the other GAO recommendations. (See app. IV.)

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CONGRESS

The report presents opportunities for more economically and efficiently managing Federal libraries.

It also invites congressional attention to the copyright issue as it pertains to libraries. Pending copyright litigation could significantly affect the present unrestricted reproduction of information by libraries. Recent congressional efforts to revise copyright legislation have not been successful. (See pp. 33 and 34.)

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Federal libraries, with their reservoirs of reference information, are vital to Government agencies in developing policies, planning programs, and improving operations. "Federal libraries," as used throughout this report, refers only to executive agency libraries.

Increasing population, rising educational levels, and the explosive growth of recorded knowledge, over the past few decades, have greatly increased demands on Federal libraries for information services.

Generally Federal libraries have been created through formal authorization within the agencies, such as administrative orders citing the need to collect and disseminate information. Only the National Library of Medicine in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created by specific legislation.

Library literature states that the Federal library structure is the outgrowth of many independently formed libraries. Special research efforts have provided an overall view of Federal libraries from time to time. Recent broad-scale library reviews have included:

--A survey, begun in 1959, by the Brookings Institution under a grant from the Council on Library Resources. The institution's report was published in 1963.

--A study, begun in 1966, by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. The Commission's report was published in 1968.

A report on a study by Markuson and others[1] estimated that there were about 2,500 Federal libraries in 1971 and that their fiscal year 1970 operating expenditures exceeded $128 million. The report was based on data from 964 replies

[1] Barbara Evans Markuson and others, "Automation and the Federal Library Community." Falls Church, Virginia, System Development Corporation, July 1971.

to a survey questionnaire sent to the more than 2,000 libraries listed in the "Roster of Federal Libraries."[1] It showed that of the 964 libraries:

--52 percent were technical or special libraries whose interests included such subjects as law, physics, chemistry, and electronics.

--34 percent were similar to public libraries and provided general and recreational materials to military personnel, their dependents, and hospitalized veterans.

--17 percent were school libraries, primarily overseas, for kindergarten, grade school, and high school.

--60 percent of the libraries were in the continental United States and about 14 percent were in Washington, D.C.; Virginia; and Maryland.

Budgeted operating costs for fiscal year 1972 totaled $49.4 million for 136 Federal libraries in Metropolitan Washington which furnished budgetary data in response to our questionnaire. (See app. I.) Of this amount, $26 million was budgeted by the Department of Agriculture for the National Agricultural Library and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the National Library of Medicine.

Officials of the Office of Management and Budget responsible for the administration of activities discussed in this report are listed in appendix II. Mr. L. Quincy Mumford has served as Chairman of the Federal Library Committee since its inception in 1965.

---

[1]Mildred Benton and Signe Ottersen, "Roster of Federal Libraries." Washington, D.C., The George Washington University, October 1970.

CHAPTER 2

NEED FOR IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF FEDERAL LIBRARIES

Federal libraries are managed primarily through the direction of agency heads and OMB's central direction. This chapter deals with the need for OMB to strengthen its role in the management of libraries.

OMB functions include (1) assisting in developing efficient coordinating mechanisms to implement Government activities and to expand interagency cooperation and (2) promoting the development of improved administrative management plans and advising executive agencies on improved administrative organization and practice. OMB exercises its central management authority over activities such as library services principally by reviewing agencies' budgets and issuing management instructions which are binding on the agencies.

THE HISTORIC NEED FOR IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF LIBRARIES

The need for improved management of Federal libraries has been recognized for many years. In 1898 the Librarian of Congress expressed such a need.

In 1937 an American Library Association report recommended the establishment of a Federal library council which would have a close relationship with the agency now designated as OMB. The report foresaw numerous areas of library operations which could benefit from a council's studies and recommendations. It stated that:

> "The Council's functions would include advice on such matters as the determination of the fields of subject interest in the book collections of the various libraries, the formulation of book selection policies, the finding of satisfactory solutions to administrative and technical problems connected with library buildings and equipment, cataloging and classification, staff recruitment, establishment of new libraries or the consolidation of existing libraries."

The report concluded that a council could help eliminate unnecessary duplicate services, create library development policies, and increase administrative efficiency.

In November 1963 the Brookings Institution published a report on a survey and conference on Federal departmental libraries.[1] The report observed that:

> "The present organization and management of departmental libraries is, to a considerable extent, an outgrowth of their adventitious development. Libraries were established without any clear specification of their functions, materials to be collected, cataloging controls to be employed, and the principles which should govern their services. These matters were worked out on an ad hoc basis mainly by the librarians in response to their changing situations."

The report included a number of recommendations to agency heads and librarians, such as:

--Formulate a clear statement of a library's scope and mission.

--Inform agency staff regularly of library resources, services, and new material of special interest.

--Establish a Federal library journal to improve communication among librarians.

Further, the report recommended that OMB

> "establish a Federal Library Council * * * to conduct and foster studies, and to advise on policies and action needed for more effective library service."

In 1965 the Library of Congress and several Federal agencies with OMB cooperation formed the council, known as the Federal Library Committee (FLC). FLC has no statutory status, no authority, and no personnel other than an Executive Secretariat.

---

[1]Harold Orlans, ed., "Federal Departmental Libraries." By Luther Evans and others. Washington, Brookings Institution, 1963.

In an article on FLC, published in 1970,[1] the Administrative Assistant to the Librarian of Congress stated that there was a general understanding when FLC was formed that OMB would use FLC recommendations as a basis for issuing instructions to Federal agencies for improving their library operations. At FLC's first meeting its Chairman stressed the advisory role of FLC, noted that FLC recommendations could not bind a particular department, and indicated an intention to seek OMB advice on the most appropriate ways of submitting recommendations to OMB. The FLC Executive Secretary informed us that FLC has not sought this advice and that FLC had submitted only one recommendation to OMB.

OMB, however, is not restricted to FLC as a source of recommendations for library management. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is another source.

ADVISORY GROUPS NOT EFFECTIVE IN PROVIDING LIBRARY MANAGEMENT LEADERSHIP

FLC and the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science may meet certain Federal library needs. For example, FLC arranges monthly meetings to enable Federal librarians to exchange information and discuss problems. It also has informed librarians of research projects they might undertake and has developed proposals for such projects, which include the locations of sponsors to finance the research.

FLC members also manage agency libraries. FLC has not made recommendations to OMB, because it has encountered difficulty reaching decisions on proposed recommendations which certain members did not consider to be in the interests of their agency libraries. For example, FLC has not been able to agree on the need for or desirability of a central depository.

---

[1]Marlene Morrisey, "Historical Development and Organization of the Federal Library Committee." Drexel library Quarterly, Vol. 6, July-October 1970.

In a letter to us dated May 12, 1972, Alan M. Rees, Professor of Library Science, Case Western Reserve University, stated that:

> "The present 'illness' affecting Federal libraries is not paucity of problem solving ability but rather the lack of a mechanism to launch a concerted attack on the problems."

Bernard M. Fry, Dean of the Graduate Library School, Indiana University, in a letter to us, dated June 8, 1972, noted that:

> "For at least the past decade it has become commonplace to consider that each library should be able to access and utilize the resources of other libraries. Careful attention needs to be given to factors essential to orderly development and operation of library resource programs which would take into account the avoidance of needless duplication of expensive materials."

Professor Rees and Dean Fry volunteered almost identical views on FLC and its relationship to OMB. They said FLC had achieved consensus on programs with broad-appeal, but that FLC would have been more effective in providing coordination and overall planning for Federal libraries if it were within OMB and therefore had decisionmaking authority.

According to an OMB official Federal libraries are one of the few functional areas which have not yet come under intensive OMB management review. He stated that OMB desires to explore methods of providing central management policy for the Federal libraries.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing considerations and the matters relating to library operations, as discussed in the next two chapters, show that improved management of Federal libraries would promote their economical and effective administration.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE DIRECTOR, OMB

We recommend that the OMB be more active in encouraging improved management and coordination of Federal library

activities and that it consider, among its initial actions, implementing the recommendations in the next two chapters on specific matters relating to libraries.

AGENCY COMMENTS

OMB, by letter dated February 13, 1973 (see app. III), stated that encouraging improved management and coordination of executive branch activities is an important part of its role and that it plans to help FLC deal with more meaningful problems.

According to OMB, FLC could handle, or was already handling, our general recommendation above and most of the specific recommendations on page 31. We believe that FLC cannot effect any meaningful action without OMB's support.

OMB also referred to its institutional role, noting that it would be undesirable to interpose itself routinely in any management function undertaken in the many agencies. We believe that the matters discussed in chapters 3 and 4 relate to broad management policies and procedures which transcend the routine management of individual libraries and, in our opinion, are OMB's responsibility.

CHAPTER 3

NEED TO CONSIDER CENTRAL STORAGE FOR LITTLE-USED MATERIALS

Federal libraries, partly because of their need to store valuable but infrequently used materials, sooner or later outgrow their available storage space. The Federal library storage problem in Metropolitan Washington could be solved by establishing a central depository for storing little-used materials. Such a depository could result in substantially reducing annual space costs and in providing other benefits, such as eliminating duplicate copies of material and postponing or eliminating the need for additional facilities.

NEED FOR A CENTRAL DEPOSITORY

In addition to reducing space costs, a central depository could improve libraries' technical operations. For example:

--Without a central depository, little-used but valuable materials may be weeded out of collections, discarded, and permanently lost.

--Members of a depository can purchase and share expensive or specialized reference materials.

The Brookings Institution report proposed central storage for Federal libraries.[1] Since then at least one Federal librarian has, from time to time, raised the central storage issue with FLC. No plan, however, has been adopted to establish such a depository.

Our discussions with 44 Federal librarians in the metropolitan area revealed that 16 libraries had no space to accommodate growth, 18 had space to accommodate growth of 5 years or less, and 10 had no space problems.

Federal librarians have proposed significant expenditures for additional facilities. Two have each proposed $15 million expansions and another has proposed rehabilitating an adjacent building for $4.7 million. Other Federal librarians are also considering expansions.

---

[1]Orlans, op. cit.

Prominent librarians and information specialists have noted the efforts of librarians to build large and unique collections of materials. The director of a national library which grants funds to other libraries for improving their services commented in March 1971 on building collections, as follows:

> "Between 1965 and 1970, we awarded $44,500,000 in grants to more than 300 libraries throughout the country. I have recently analyzed the utilization of these funds by these libraries. You have to appreciate that a grant, once awarded, is really no longer tightly controlled by the granting agency, and the monies can be used in accordance with local needs. * * * more than 50 percent of these funds were used by libraries for building collections. That, I think, is real evidence for the concern expressed here that everybody wants to have a bigger collection."

NON-FEDERAL CENTRAL DEPOSITORIES

Since the late 1930s, when central depositories originated, there has been greater pressure for, and progress toward, formal arrangements for sharing library resources. Of the 23 central depositories for libraries operated by academic groups, 20 were established after 1960. These depositories offer centralized storage and related services to members.

We visited the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago, interviewed its director, toured the center, and discussed its services with the librarians of four members.

The center, a nonprofit central depository, was established in 1949 to provide its eight original members with access to low-use materials. Its director informed us that in December 1971 the center had 66 members and was considering additional membership applications. The center's members are located in the United States and Canada and represent a diverse group of public and private organizations.

The center's collection has grown from about 500,000 volumes to more than 3,000,000 volumes. Members contribute their old, low-use materials to the center, and the center

has purchased additional materials, such as newspaper back files and German monographs published before 1601. The materials are stored in a six-story warehouse-type structure with temperature and humidity controls on each level. The director explained that the center can store different types of material under different conditions. For example, microform publications require cooler than normal temperatures.

Center materials may be borrowed by a member and generally kept as long as needed. Libraries request materials from the center by telephone or other communication methods. The center usually fills requests on the day that they are received. The requesting library, which may be located a considerable distance from the center, usually receives the materials within 3 to 4 days, depending on the mode of delivery.

The center's director informed us that the time required to physically transfer requested materials was one of the center's major problems. He said, however, that the center was meeting members' needs and showed us commendatory letters from members in California and Western Canada. We visited a librarian in Indiana and three in Illinois who were employed by center members. All were satisfied with the center's service.

AGE AND USE OF FEDERAL LIBRARY MATERIALS

We sent questionnaires to 230 Federal librarians in Metropolitan Washington to obtain information on their libraries. Appendix I summarizes the responses. Some of the data were based on librarians' estimates.

We analyzed data supplied by 114 libraries on the age and use of books and comparable data supplied by 108 libraries on periodicals. Our analysis showed a relatively high degree of use for newer materials, those up to 10 years old, and a marked decline in use for older materials. The following table demonstrates the decline in use of materials as they grow older; it compares the age and use of books and periodicals in one of the responding libraries, which in our opinion fairly typifies the libraries responding.

Age in years (inclusive)	Percentages			
	Books		Periodicals	
	Holdings	Use	Holdings	Use
0 to 4	10	40	5	40
5 to 9	10	25	5	25
10 to 24	25	15	30	15
25 and over	55	20	60	20

The table shows that those books in the zero-to-4 age group accounted for only 10 percent of the library's total book holdings but for 40 percent of book use; in contrast, the books in the 25-year and over age group accounted for 55 percent of the holdings but for only 20 percent of book use. The table shows a more pronounced disparity between age and use for periodicals.

A study by Orr and others of the characteristics of sources cited in medical research papers showed similar results.[1] Articles published 10 or more years before the study accounted for 27 percent of the citations; articles

---

[1]Richard H. Orr and others, "Development of Methodologic Tools for Planning and Managing Library Service: II. Measuring a Library's Capability for Providing Documents." Bulletin of Medical Library Association, Vol. 56, July 1968.

published 31 or more years before the study accounted for only 5 percent of the citations.

In 1961 Fussler and Simon reported findings on age-and-use patterns for certain classes of monographs in a major research library.[1] The study, involving 1,642 monographs, showed that if 50 percent of the monographs were transferred from the library to lower cost storage, only about 15 percent would be recalled one or more times over a 5-year period. The study showed that, if a library kept use records, the number of recalls could be reduced about 50 percent because the more frequently used materials, despite their age, would be retained at the library rather than transferred to lower cost storage.

BENEFITS OF A CENTRAL DEPOSITORY

We estimate that creating such a depository in Metropolitan Washington could reduce annual space costs by about $920,000. Our estimate was based on (1) the transfer of about 4 million books and periodicals 10 or more years old to a central depository, (2) a system of storing 45 volumes a square foot of space in the depository, and (3) reducing costs by 23 cents a volume. ("Volume" as used in this report covers information sources such as books, periodicals, and reports.)

The use data supplied by the libraries responding to our questionnaires indicated that the most economical time for transferring materials to a central depository is when the materials are between 5 and 10 years old. The age-of-holdings data supplied by the libraries indicated that they had about 2.8 million books and 1.2 million periodicals that were 10 or more years old and could be transferred.

The conventional open-stack library provides tables, chairs, study areas, and wide aisles and contains other space arrangements which result in low-density storage--about 15 volumes for each square foot of space available. A central depository, however, generally provides almost no

---

[1]Herman H. Fussler and Julian L. Simon, "Patterns in the Use of Books in Large Research Libraries." Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1969.

amenities for walk-in patrons and therefore uses space more compactly--essentially as a warehousing operation.

Ellsworth studied library storage problems and in 1969 published data on 12 systems for storing library materials.[1] The systems ranged from a conventional library storing 15 volumes a square foot to a high-density computer-directed storage system with potential for storing 147 volumes a square foot. The midrange systems stored 45, 46, and 50 volumes a square foot.

Federal libraries are generally in office buildings. The General Services Administration estimated that this type of floorspace costs from $5 a square foot in nearby Maryland and Virginia to $5.50 a square foot in Washington and that warehouse space costs an average of $1.78 a square foot in suburban areas. On the basis of these estimates, we calculated the libraries' annual cost of storing a volume at 37 cents for space only.

The Center for Research Libraries' storage system is more compact than that of an open-stack library. According to the director, it costs 14 cents annually to store a single volume, including space, personnel, and operating costs. Thus, for the 4 million volumes which could be transferred to a central depository, we estimate that annual space costs could be reduced by 23 cents a volume, or about $920,000.

Such a depository would also provide additional benefits which are difficult to measure. The other benefits include:

--Transferring additional books and periodicals in subsequent years.

--Eliminating unneeded duplicate copies of material contributed by members.

--Encouraging the introduction of modern processing systems appropriate to large-scale library operations.

---

[1]Ralph E. Ellsworth, "The Economics of Book Storage in College and University Libraries." Metuchen, N.J., Association of Research Libraries and Scarecrow Press, 1969.

--Facilitating the work of researchers by concentrating the reference materials of many libraries at one location.

--Postponing or eliminating the need for additional library facilities.

CONCLUSIONS

Little-used materials should be transferred to a central depository for storage in lower priced space. Such a depository for Federal libraries in Metropolitan Washington would enable agencies to upgrade the use of space presently used to store these materials.

The director of the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago noted that 3 or 4 days sometimes elapsed before member libraries in the United States and Canada received requested materials. Delays should not be a problem in a central depository system operating in the metropolitan area.

AGENCY COMMENTS

Our draft report sent to OMB for comment proposed that OMB initiate action to establish a central depository for Federal libraries. In its comments, OMB stated that the report did not contain sufficient information to judge whether a central depository would be cost effective, that additional analysis would be required to determine a precise payoff on such an investment, and that this matter would be reviewed at the highest level within OMB.

By letter dated January 12, 1973 (see app. IV), FLC stated that it would welcome the opportunity to review the need for central depository.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE DIRECTOR, OMB

We recommend that OMB initiate a cost-benefit study to determine the feasibility of establishing a central depository for Federal libraries and establish such a depository if the study indicates that it would be beneficial.

CHAPTER 4

OPPORTUNITIES FOR OTHER IMPROVEMENTS IN FEDERAL LIBRARY OPERATIONS

This chapter discusses additional aspects of Federal library operations which indicate that OMB should be directing more attention to ascertaining Federal library needs, to making decisions in response to those needs, and to launching and maintaining momentum for programs ministering to those needs.

MICROFORM PUBLICATIONS

Our interviews with Federal librarians in the metropolitan area indicated that most libraries are not realizing the full benefits of microform publications.

Microform publications--which include rolls (microfilm) and cards (microfiche)--contain miniaturized images which may be restored to large size through special reading equipment. Microform enables libraries to reduce space requirements and reproduction and shipping costs.

Up to 3,000 pages of material can be stored on 100 feet of microfilm. A 4-by-6-inch microfiche, using an image reduction ratio of 24 to 1, can store up to 98 frames, or pages, of material. Ultramicrofiche, using higher reduction ratios, provides even greater compaction. For example, a manufacturer is reported to have replaced a 17,000-page catalog with 12 ultramicrofiche.

The term "microform" as used in this report refers to miniaturized materials which librarians may purchase as opposed to materials purchased in conventional hardcopy and later converted to microform.

Microform has gained widespread acceptance in the scientific and technical fields. Some scientific and technical publications are available in both hardcopy and microform. Hardcopy versions of other publications in these fields have been discontinued. For example, one Federal agency involved in technical research furnishes reports to its contractors in microform only.

Microform is also available for periodicals, such as Time, Newsweek, and Fortune, intended for the general reader. The National Register of Microform Masters, published annually by the Library of Congress, provides a comprehensive list of microform masters from which microform publications may be produced and the organizations from which they may be acquired.

Of 41 librarians we questioned about the extent of their microform holdings, 15 told us they had substantial holdings and 26 said they did not. Of 38 librarians we questioned, 36 told us that some of their hardcopy holdings could be replaced by microform. Of 30 librarians we queried on user response, 17 said it was adverse, 4 said it was mixed, 3 said it was favorable, and 6 gave no easily classifiable answers.

Microform generally costs less to purchase or reproduce than hardcopy. For example, the National Technical Information Service in the Department of Commerce sells publications of 300 pages or less for $3 in hardcopy and 95 cents in microfiche. It is relatively inexpensive to duplicate materials whose images have been highly reduced. A microfiche containing 98 pages of information may be reproduced for about 16 cents, or about 6 pages for a cent.

Microform is generally cheaper to ship than hardcopy. About 10 pounds of material can be reduced to ultramicrofiche weighing an ounce or less.

The use of microform in Federal libraries appears to be hindered by problems with funding, equipment standards, and user resistance.

Funding. To use microform Federal libraries need supporting equipment, such as readers and reader-printers. Small readers cost about $100; reader-printers cost more. Some Federal librarians told us that the use of microform in their libraries is hampered by a lack of funds to obtain reading equipment.

Federal librarians in some agencies are asked or required to submit information for preparing the library budget; others are not. Regardless of the participation of librarians in the budget process, their needs are subject to the judgments of top officials in the organization.

OMB interest in a microform program, expressed during its reviews of agency budgets and its issuance of management circulars on the subject, could encourage such a program.

Equipment standards. Librarians must determine what types and complements of microform equipment are needed, what degrees of equipment sophistication are needed, and what reduction ratios should be provided for. In our opinion, OMB should provide librarians with technical advice on microform equipment and guidelines on purchase versus leasing under the conditions of a rapidly changing technology.

User resistance. Librarians encounter some user resistance to microform. The viewing screen of the reading equipment is less mobile than a publication held manually and somewhat restricts the movement of the user while reading. Some users prefer hardcopy (obtained through use of a reader-printer or printer) enabling them to underscore passages or make marginal notes. Some users need assistance to operate the reading equipment.

Students, as a special class of users, do not appear highly resistant to microform. Nelson referred to a study which showed no evident aversion by students to microform.[1] He corroborated this finding, stating that he had:

> "visited locations presently using microfiche and discussed their use of it, their attitudes, and their evaluation. It came as a distinct surprise, and a favorable one, that in all of the installations visited, there was little criticism, though constructive suggestions were given. At one university at which there was a large [microform] collection, three students had written doctoral dissertations completely from information found on microfilm, by using computer search and a microfiche information bank."

---

[1] Carl E. Nelson, "Microform Technology." Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, Vol. 6, 1971.

Fry, in a study of an educational information system,[1] stated that a consistent theme by users and operators of information services was the need for more, better, and less expensive microform readers. His study produced widespread evidence that potential users were not taking advantage of microform.

Some users find microform inconvenient and some are reluctant to change their reading habits. Additional efforts, therefore, are needed to create a climate more receptive to microform.

COORDINATION OF RESEARCH ON LIBRARY OPERATIONS

From 1965 through 1971 five Federal agencies sponsored research, individually, at a total cost of about $26 million, which dealt in large part with the Federal library system or the Nation's library system. The agencies were the National Science Foundation; the National Agricultural Library, Department of Agriculture; the National Library of Medicine and the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Department of the Army. Other Federal agencies sometimes sponsored library research intended primarily for application within their own libraries.

In broadest terms library research attempts to gather information about a chosen segment of library activities to achieve such objectives as lowering administrative costs or increasing the scope or quality of services. Most aspects of library operations have been researched to some extent. Research projects, for example, have included studies of the duties and training needs of personnel, methods to improve space use, and cooperative arrangements among libraries to improve user access to services.

The five agencies have not established a formal system for coordinating proposed and ongoing research. Also, we found no substantial informal interchange of information among the agencies which would make a formal system unnecessary. Coordination is needed when several agencies sponsor

---

[1] Bernard M. Fry, "Evaluation Study of ERIC Products and Services." Washington, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 1972.

research conducted about the same time in the same subject area. Under these circumstances coordination may help provide an overall rationale for research and may sometimes determine the sequence in which individual projects are to be undertaken. Coordination also may result in modifying the scope or objectives of individual projects and in determining whether competing projects should be considered for consolidation or other management action.

Our discussion of the management of library research with officials of four of the agencies indicated that each of the agencies generally monitors its research programs without specific knowledge of the other agencies' research projects. The agencies had, at about the same time, separately sponsored research on automation of bibliographic records. We did not review research designs, objectives, or findings to consider how coordination among the agencies might have affected these projects.

According to an official at one of the agencies, reports on the results of the research sponsored by his agency were not generally made available to the Federal library community or to the public. Many of the 44 librarians we interviewed were not aware of the studies for improving library operations. Of the 44, two indicated that they planned to use the research results in their operations.

Libbey and Fry commented on the difficulties in locating and identifying Federal technical library and information science research projects.[1] They sought information from organizations financing research, from those conducting research, and from literature on libraries and information science. They used 37 sources in identifying research projects, including data from the Science Information Exchange of the Smithsonian Institution and the microfiche edition of the "Inventory of Information Science and Technology" published by the Committee on Scientific and Technical Information, which is affiliated with the Federal Council for

---

[1]Miles A. Libbey and Bernard M. Fry, "A Data Base of Research Affecting Military Technical Information Services." Washington, Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, December 1971.

Science and Technology. At December 1971 they had identified about 1,000 projects which were in progress or were completed at the end of fiscal year 1969. The authors commented:

> "*** there is not now, nor has there been, any effort involving across-the-board cooperation between Federal agencies to establish a program of research and development leading to better understanding of and improvements in Federal technical information services. *** There has been no single agency responsible for instituting or even catalyzing such a national program."

COOPERATION IN ACQUIRING MATERIALS

Federal libraries have only infrequently entered into cooperative agreements, similar to those established among non-Federal libraries, for acquiring materials, such as books and periodicals.

In 1964, five major universities in the metropolitan area formed a library consortium whose objectives included cooperative acquisition of materials, collective development of resources, and better use of operating funds. The five libraries, among other things:

--Notify one another of purchases or an intent to purchase.

--Have agreed to transfer responsibility for special holdings, such as maps and Government publications, to designated libraries.

--Maintain consolidated directories.

--Have a unified service for delivering materials among the libraries.

Subject to approval by the universities' governing bodies and faculties, the consortium intends to consolidate materials for about 20 areas of graduate study.

The consortium coordinator told us that the consortium's potential savings were not calculable, but that the members are certain that coordination and cooperation will reduce overall costs.

Opportunities for similar cooperative agreements exist in the Federal library system. For example, libraries in the several agencies concerned with human resources might acquire better collections of materials at the same or lower cost if they had an overall plan for acquiring human resources materials.

The Ohio College Library Center (Ohio center) and the Center for Research Libraries (Chicago center) share their resources with their members.

The Ohio center is a not-for-profit corporation chartered "to make the resources of all Ohio libraries available to each." It provides centralized, online computer-based services for approximately 50 academic libraries. The center's cataloging system became operational in August 1971. In October 1972 several regional library groups were observing the center's operations to evaluate whether such a cataloging system could meet their needs.

The Ohio center has entered into other activities common to libraries. For example, it is developing a technical processing system to aid in purchasing books and a system to control the purchase and use of periodicals.

The Federal Library Cooperative Center Study Group, an ad hoc group composed primarily of Federal librarians, in June 1972 arranged for the Ohio center's director to develop an organizational plan for increasing cooperative efforts in the Federal library system.

The Chicago center has begun to procure and hold specialized, little-used serial publications, such as magazines, trade journals, and Government documents, for its member libraries in the United States and Canada. The center's director managed a study of the costs of owning versus borrowing serials.[1] The study report stated that, unless a serial is used about six times a year, it is less costly for a library to borrow it than to buy it. The report estimated that more than half the serials in large research libraries may be used too little to justify purchasing them. The report suggests that the center's program for specialized, little-used serials should reduce costs for members with little adverse effect on services.

Corroborating this conclusion, the Orr study of sources cited in biomedical research papers published in fiscal years 1963-65 showed that 90 percent of the sources were serials.[2] Further, 20 serials accounted for a third of the sources. The remaining two-thirds of the sources were scattered over 223 other serials and 50 nonserials.

---

[1]Gordon Williams and others, "Library Cost Models: Owning Versus Borrowing Serial Publications." Washington, National Science Foundation, November 1968.

[2]Orr, loc. cit.

Several studies indicate that publications owned by libraries are on the shelf only slightly more than half the time that they are requested. Member libraries in a cooperative serials-buying arrangement, such as the Chicago center's, can improve services by concentrating on purchasing multiple copies of the commonly used serials.

The Chicago center's study of owning versus borrowing serials and corroborative studies suggest that economies could be realized if Federal libraries entered into cooperative agreements for procuring little-used publications in such subject areas as human resources, environmental preservation, and law enforcement. Each of these subjects falls within the jurisdictions of several Federal agencies.

During our visits to Federal libraries in the metropolitan area, we learned of one informal cooperative materials sharing agreement between two libraries. This agreement involved the purchase and use of the Chemical Abstracts and the Engineering Index. Although other informal cooperative agreements may exist among the Federal libraries in the metropolitan area, in our opinion, they are unlikely, on an informal basis, to exploit the full potential for sharing publications or to include the broadest practical participation of libraries.

INTEGRATION OF FEDERAL AGENCY INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Rees, in a 1971 report,[1] stated that there is an urgent need to integrate a Federal agency's library and its other information groups which store, analyze, and retrieve information. Several investigators he cited found that the lack of such integration resulted in duplication of effort, conflicts, and diminished efficiency of the total information system.

According to Rees, the period 1958-63 was crucial to Federal management of scientific and technical information; Federal librarians, however, did not respond to the concern of high-level Government officials for the need to sift, evaluate, compile, and consolidate the growing store of such information. Rees referred to a statement by the Director of Technical Information of the Department of Defense that technical librarians operate essentially as archivists for published literature. According to Rees, this prevented the effective integration of libraries into larger scientific information systems.

In tracing the Government's changing information needs, the Rees report concluded that the traditional functions of Federal libraries were conceived of too narrowly to serve the broad information missions which later emerged in Federal agencies. Rees quoted G. S. Simpson, Jr., who suggested that

> "conventional libraries were sufficient up to the 20th Century. Specialized libraries then developed...Scientific information centers are but an extension of that trend...(and) are necessary to reduce, analyze and shrink to manageable proportions all such data and information."

Other information groups with some interface with Federal libraries have recently been established. These groups, which emphasize the evaluative function in organizing information, have been formed mainly in mission-oriented

---

[1] Alan M. Rees, "Interface of Technical Libraries with Other Information Systems: A Synthesis." Washington, Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, March 1971.

agencies to collect, process, and distribute special data. They include document centers, information analysis centers, referral centers, clearinghouses, and technical information centers. Technical information centers also organize sources of information, such as unpublished research reports, journal articles, and pamphlets.

Conaway's report on an inquiry into other information groups in Federal agencies cited four substantial problem areas resulting from the dual information networks within the agencies.[1]

Duplication of functions. The other information groups evaluate data and create information--which distinguishes them from the libraries. However, both the information groups and the libraries acquire, collect, record, organize, store, retrieve, and disseminate informational materials. The Conaway report concluded that the agencies which created other information groups did not fully use existing library resources.

Administrative placement. The other information groups have a stronger administrative placement than libraries when considered in terms of organizational position, financial resources, relative staff size, and salaries. The Conaway report concluded that differences in administrative status have caused morale, effectiveness, and recruitment problems for libraries. Some libraries, however, were strengthened by mergers with the information groups.

Domination of information handling by nonlibrarians. The newcomers to the information field have generally been nonlibrarians and include chemists, physicists, statisticians, physicians, psychiatrists, and specialists in electronic data processing. According to the Conaway report, the newcomers have tended to dominate the information activities in agencies having dual information networks and have higher status and salaries and increased promotion opportunities; in some cases librarians have transferred to nonlibrarian jobs to gain status.

---

[1] O. B. Conaway, "Extra-Library Information Programs in Selected Federal Agencies." Washington, Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, September 1970.

Disparities in hierarchial position of personnel. Directors of four nonlibrary information groups studied by Conaway had higher job classifications than the library directors, as shown below:

Agency	Director's grade: Nonlibrary information group	Director's grade: Library
A	GS-16	GS-13
B	GS-14	GS-13
C	GS-17	GS-14
D	GS-15	GS-11

Also, the grade levels of professional employees in the other information groups were higher than those of professional library employees. The Conaway report concluded that the disparity of salaries affected morale and performance of librarians and made recruitment more difficult. It concluded also that this disparity was a major factor underlying all the controversies over establishing other information groups.

- - - -

Some Federal agencies with highly technical orientations have set up dual information systems without centrally managing them.

Painter, in a 1968 report, concluded that libraries could not be consigned to act as storehouses, that the lines of demarcation between libraries and information centers were disappearing, and that no one was certain of the character of the system which would evolve.[1]

The Rees report stated that Federal agencies have obtained funding for, and have created, new information organizations without, apparently, fully using their

---

[1] Ann F. Painter, "The Role of the Library in Relation to Other Information Activities." Washington, Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, August 1968.

libraries.[1] The report concluded that the dual information systems were essentially complementary rather than competitive and that accompanying problems--duplicate efforts and overlapping functions with consequent conflicts and diminished efficiency--were not self-correcting.

CONCLUSIONS

--Federal libraries would benefit from microform publications or from other methods of compacting library materials.

--Federal library research should be coordinated. Information on ongoing and completed research should be collected at a central point and the extent to which research recommendations should be put into practice should be determined.

--Federal libraries should enter into cooperative agreements for acquiring library materials to minimize multiple acquisitions and should integrate their libraries and other information systems.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DIRECTOR, OMB

We recommend that, to improve Federal library operations, OMB develop policies and plans to:

--Encourage the use of microform publications or other methods of compacting library materials, including necessary technical and financial assistance.

--Coordinate library research, collect at a central point information about ongoing and completed research, and determine the extent to which Federal agencies should act on research recommendations.

--Encourage cooperation among libraries to minimize multiple acquisitions of library materials and in other activities, such as cataloging and controlling periodicals.

---

[1] Rees, op. cit.

--Encourage the integration of Federal agency information systems.

AGENCY COMMENTS

OMB stated that it, in collaboration with FLC, would undertake to develop the policies and plans for the acceptance and use, as appropriate, of microform or similar types of publications.

OMB stated further that the sharing of research results is done through FLC and that routine coordination of library research and followup on agency actions on research recommendations are most properly agency management's responsibility.

We believe, however, that library research, unlike scientific and other research, focuses on a single area of activity whose boundaries are definable and is thus susceptible to some central control in procurement, dissemination of research results, and followup. Library research should not be the exclusive concern of the agency that initiates or funds the research, and research benefits should be available to all agency libraries. Such benefits have not been available to all libraries either through the agencies sponsoring the research or through FLC. Therefore, for the most effective use of research funds, OMB should develop policies and plans to coordinate and follow up on library research and to disseminate research results. The record of FLC's activities provides no reason to believe that it can be effective in these functions without OMB support.

OMB commented that FLC was already working to minimize multiple acquisitions and to integrate Federal agency information systems and that its efforts held promise of benefit.

OMB noted that our report highlighted several library management problems, that most of our recommendations could be best advanced through the mechanism of FLC, and that it intended to work closely with FLC in advancing its efforts to realize the benefits of the recommendations.

FLC commented that our recommendations were especially well received because its current work program includes projects directed toward those specific points.

CHAPTER 5

THE COPYRIGHT ISSUE IN MAKING LIBRARY SERVICES AVAILABLE

Transferring knowledge depends not only on visual access to information but also on being able to reproduce it. In earlier decades copyright problems dealing with the availability of library materials focused on reproducing ink prints. As technology advanced the copyright controversy extended to reproducing microform and data in magnetic files.

Before the Copyright Act of 1909 (17 U.S.C. 1), infringement of copyright in books and other works reproduced from type was specified as unauthorized printing, importing, or offering for sale copies of the work. Copying, by itself, did not constitute infringement. Some have interpreted the act as broadening the definition of infringement to include any unauthorized copying. The act, however, does not contain guidelines governing reproduction by libraries.

In ensuing litigation the courts developed a doctrine of fair use. The Register of Copyrights has broadly interpreted "fair use" to mean

> "that a reasonable portion of a copyrighted work may be reproduced without permission when necessary for a legitimate purpose which is not competitive with the copyright owner's market for his work."

Librarians generally contend they are not competing with the copyright owners when they reproduce materials for library users. Authors and publishers contend that such reproduction extends beyond fair use and substantially reduces the market for copyrighted work. Both interest groups express the need for new copyright legislation.

A coordinated effort to develop a general revision of the act was begun in 1955, when the Congress provided funds for comprehensive research programs and studies, including inquiry into the history and provisions of the act, the problems raised, the past proposals for revision, and comparable provisions in foreign laws and international conventions.

Several draft bills emerged and congressional committees held extended hearings. However, practical solutions which would satisfy the various private and public interests were not found.

Senate bill 644, 92d Congress, proposed a general revision of the act. It limited the exclusive rights of copyright owners, recognized the fair use doctrine, helped clarify the extent of permissible library copying, and dealt with computers and other mechanical and electrical information systems. However, the 92d Congress adjourned without enacting the bill.

The Williams and Wilkins Company, a publisher, has filed a petition in the United States Court of Claims charging a Government library with infringement of its copyrights. Federal officials have informed us that, if a revised copyright law is not enacted, the Court's decision could significantly affect libraries' present unrestricted reproduction practices.

CHAPTER 6

SCOPE OF REVIEW

During our review we:

--Reviewed literature on library operations and information science.

--Interviewed 44 Federal librarians in the metropolitan area and toured some of their libraries.

--Discussed Federal library problems with other librarians, library consultants, and information science experts, including members and officials of FLC, the Committee on Scientific and Technical Information, and the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

--Visited a private library center providing central storage and other services to member libraries and discussed operations with the center's managing director and four members' librarians.

--Visited a national microform and information systems exhibition and Federal sites using microform.

--Sent questionnaires to 230 addressees in the metropolitan area selected from lists of Federal libraries.

APPENDIX I

GAO LIBRARY QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS

We sent questionnaires to 230 addressees in the metropolitan area selected from the "Roster of Federal Libraries" and the FLC mailing list. Our questionnaire requested data on budgets, personnel, shelf space, nature of hardcopy holdings, and the age and use of those holdings. We received 193 responses which were classifiable as follows:

Questionnaires fully or partially executed and considered in our analyses	139
Questionnaires which were nonresponsive or were received too late	12
Questionnaires from respondents who stated that their libraries were outside our interests because they were no longer operating or were non-Federal libraries	42
Total	193

APPENDIX II

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

February 13, 1973

Mr. George H. Staples
Associate Director
United States General
Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

Dear Mr. Staples:

Thank you for the draft report on Federal Library operations sent through John Lordan of my staff on December 15, 1972. The draft report represents very ambitious efforts to analyze the diverse set of Federal libraries from a management point of view. As such, it merits praise for highlighting many of the issues which have challenged Federal managers for some time.

The report draft contains introductory language on page 4 which outlines the author's view of institutional relationships in the Federal library world:

> "Federal agency libraries are primarily subject to the management direction of their respective agency heads and to the central direction of OMB. This report deals with the need for strengthening OMB's role in the central management of libraries. The functions of OMB include (1) assisting in developing efficient coordinating mechanisms to implement government activities and to expand interagency cooperation and (2) promoting the development of improved plans of administrative management and advising the executive departments and agencies of the government with respect to improved administrative organization and practice.
>
> "OMB exercises its central management authority over activities such as library services principally through its review of agencies' budgets and its issuance of management instructions which are binding upon the executive agencies."

I agree that libraries are primarily subject to the management of their respective agency heads. Moreover, with the exception of a small number of National libraries, they exist almost exclusively to support the realization of agency goals. Thus the heads of the respective agencies are in the best position to evaluate library performance in the light of the unique goals of their agency.

Again excepting the National libraries, the estimated $23.4 million spent on 136 Federal libraries in Metropolitan Washington is not broken out in the Federal budget document. Thus, this expenditure is not a practical management lever for OMB to use in exercising what the report author views as its central management role.

Let me now turn to comments on the report draft's specific recommendations.

- ". . . OMB assume a more active role in the central direction of Federal libraries. . . (emphasis supplied) (draft report, page8)."

- OMB COMMENT: While it is not entirely clear what is meant by "central direction", I believe it is inappropriate for the Office of Management and Budget to attempt to interpose itself routinely in the central direction of any management function undertaken in the many departments and agencies of the government. This would draw OMB into an operational role which is not desirable. It is, however, an important part of the OMB role to encourage improved management and coordination of Executive Branch activities. We believe that the FLC could deal with more meaningful problems and we plan to help them move in that direction.

- ". . . (OMB) initiate action to establish a central depository for Federal libraries . . ." (draft report, page 18.)

  OMB COMMENT: Your report does not contain sufficient information to judge whether a central repository for Federal libraries is in fact cost effective. Such factors as operating cost of a new facility and cost of movement of materials to multiple service points must be considered.

It is also true that the impact on service to library customers would weigh heavily in deciding whether a central repository is really an improvement.

Additional analysis is required before we can determine the precise payoff on any such investment. I will review this situation with Mr. Ash when he officially assumes his role as Director of OMB.

- ". . . (OMB) encourage the acceptance and use of microform publications and equipment . . ." (draft report, page 34.)

  OMB COMMENT: OMB will undertake this, as appropriate, in collaboration with the Federal Library Committee. OMB has long maintained a position of urging the use of better and more cost effective management systems. In many instances, microform systems may be the answer, but we are skeptical of any blanket conclusions about the superiority of any one approach under all circumstances.

- ". . . (OMB) coordinate procurement of Library research, . . . collect at a central point information about on-going and completed research, and . . . determine the extent to which Federal agencies act on research recommendations." (draft report, page 34.)

  OMB COMMENT: The sharing of research results is accomplished through the Federal Library Committee. Routine coordination of library research procurement as well as routine follow-up on agency actions with respect to research recommendations are most properly the responsibility of agency management and not of OMB.

- ". . . (OMB) encourage cooperation among the libraries to minimize the multiple acquisitions of library materials. (and) . . . encourage the integration of Federal agency information systems." (draft report, page 34.)

  OMB COMMENT: The Federal Library Committee has already been at work in this area and their efforts hold promise of benefit.

- ". . . OMB follow-up on research being conducted by the Ohio College Library Center . . ." (draft report, page 34).

  OMB COMMENT: This can be accomplished readily through OMB's membership on the Federal Library Committee.

By way of summary, the draft report does an important service by highlighting several library management problems. In our judgment, the implementable recommendations of the draft report are best advanced through the mechanism of the Federal Library Committee.

OMB intends to work closely with FLC in advancing its efforts to realize the benefits of the implementable recommendations contained in this report.

We would be pleased to meet with you to discuss the implications of this report, as well as the institutional role of OMB in these kinds of situations.

Sincerely,

Dwight A. Ink
Assistant Director

APPENDIX III

FEDERAL LIBRARY COMMITTEE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20540
January 12, 1973

Dear Mr. Messinger:

The Federal Library Committee appreciates the opportunity to examine and comment upon the General Accounting Office "Review of Federal Library Operations in the Washington, D. C. Metropolitan Area." We have studied the recommendations with interest and look forward to continuing collaboration with the Office of Management and Budget in strengthening and furthering Federal library programs and services.

As we have indicated before the Federal Library Committee, since its establishment in 1965, developed a comprehensive data base and has concentrated on the construction of an active work program that involves the group in a wide variety of Federal library problems. These have included the development of standard guidelines for Federal library automation, a survey of Federal library collections to provide basic knowledge on which acquisitions development and systems planning can be based, strengthening of the recruiting system for Federal librarians (by upgrading standards, broadening curriculum planning, maintaining a national register, utilizing library interns, compiling and distributing a roster of vacancies), and extending communications among Federal librarians through the FLC Newsletter and through workshops on particular library matters. To date Federal Library Committee work has been supported by foundation grants and Federal agency funds.

Thus, the Federal Library Committee has a background of experience upon which to continue its work and to cooperate in implementing further appropriate action. We would welcome the opportunity to review the need for a central depository and to document recommendations. We will continue to work toward the identification and development of technologies applicable to library requirements and to commend their acceptance.

Recommendations that the Office of Management and Budget develop plans: "...to collect at a central point information about on-going and completed research; to encourage cooperation among the libraries to minimize the multiple acquisitions of library materials; to encourage the integration of Federal agency information

---

PERMANENT MEMBERSHIP—Library of Congress (Librarian of Congress, Chairman), National Agricultural Library, National Library of Medicine, Department of State, Department of the Treasury, Department of Defense, Department of Justice, Department of the Interior, Department of Commerce, Department of Labor, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Transportation.

ROTATING MEMBERSHIP, 1971-73—Federal Communications Commission, General Services Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National Science Foundation, Supreme Court of the United States, Veterans Administration.

OBSERVERS—Office of Management and Budget and Office of Science and Technology of the Executive Office of the President, Library of Congress, Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology of the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

systems; and to follow up on research being conducted by the Ohio College Library Center..." were especially well received as the current Federal Library Committee work program includes projects directed toward these specific points. Indeed, it has been noted that the General Accounting Office's report was based in large part upon Federal Library Committee research reports and other assistance. For example, seven of the eight footnoted references to Federal library related activity are Federal Library Committee studies.

The General Accounting Office's interest in Federal library services is appreciated. We welcome the concern of those who share a realization of the importance of focusing attention on the continuing development of Federal libraries, of refining management techniques, and of increasing the support essential for their full utilization.

Sincerely yours,

Frank Kurt Cylke
Executive Secretary

Mr. Edward C. Messinger
Assistant Director
General Government Division
United States General Accounting Office
Washington, D. C. 20548

APPENDIX IV

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS OF THE OFFICE

OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF

ACTIVITIES DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT

	Tenure of office	
	From	To
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET:		
Roy L. Ash	Feb. 1973	Present
Caspar W. Weinberger	June 1972	Feb. 1973
George P. Shultz	July 1970	June 1972
Robert P. Mayo	Jan. 1969	July 1970
Charles J. Zwick	Jan. 1968	Jan. 1969

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Copies of this report are available at a cost of $1 from the U.S. General Accounting Office, Room 6417, 441 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20548. Orders should be accompanied by a check or money order. Please do not send cash.

When ordering a GAO report please use the B-Number, Date and Title, if available, to expedite filling your order.

Copies of GAO reports are provided without charge to Members of Congress, congressional committee staff members, Government officials, news media, college libraries, faculty members and students.